DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 556 SP 008 151

AUTHOR	Frankel, Edward
TITLE	Evaluation of Lehman College Undergraduate Education Program by Teacher Alumni.
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, Bronx, N.Y. Herbert H. Lehman Coll. Office of Educational Research.
REPORT NO	R-74-7
PUB DATE	Jun 74
NOTE	91p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Beginning Teachers; Methods Courses; *Participant Satisfaction; Practicums; *Preservice Education; *Program Evaluation; Student Teaching; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In an evaluation of the undergraduate education sequence conducted during the spring 1973 semester, data were obtained by means of a six-page questionnaire sent to a sample of 800 teachers who had graduated from Lehman College since 1968 and who were teaching in public schools located in the New York City area. The survey instrument provided for rating of the undergraduate education sequence, pre-student teaching field experiences, student teaching experience, and overall competency development by means of six-point scales and, in the case of some experiences, a six-point frequency scale. In general, respondents felt that foundation courses had little or no value. Methods and elective courses were also criticized for being irrelevant and not applicable to classroom practice. The majority of respondents suggested an expansion of the field experience program, more actual participation in the schools, and greater involvement with classroom teachers and students. Respondents felt that more time was necessary for the development of competencies required for classroom teaching and that toward this end student teaching should be expanded to two semesters. It is recommended that (a) a concentration in elementary education be established; (b) students be engaged in an introductory education experience as early as possible; (c) the field experience program be broadened and enhanced at all levels; (d) that 5- and 6-year specialist training programs be developed; and (e) training programs be separated into early childhood, elementary, middle, and secondary level. (HMD)

ED 092556

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
The City University of New York
Bedford Park Boulevard West
Bronx, New York 10468

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF LEHMAN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM BY TEACHER ALUMNI

Edward Frankel

Office of Educational Research
Department of Education

No. 74-7

June 1974

SP008 151

TABLES OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Introduction	1
Related Studies	2
Population	5
Part I: Background Information	12
Part II: Undergraduate Education Sequence	14
Part III: Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences	23
Part IV: Student Teaching Experience	34
Part V: Total Preparation--Competencies	46
Part VI: Recommendations for Improvement	49
Discussion	54
Summary	55
Recommendations	62
Appendices	68
Appendix A - Letters to District Superintendents, Principals, and Alumni	69
Appendix B - Evaluation Instrument: Teacher Questionnaire	75
Appendix C - Table: Comparison of Mean F and V Ratings and Their Rank Order of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	82
Appendix D - Table: Mean Frequency (F) and Value (V) Ratings for Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences and Their Rank Order	84
Appendix E - Table: Mean Mastery Ratings of Competencies for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	86

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
I	Employment Status of Lehman College Graduates	5
II	Distribution and Responses to Questionnaires Evaluating Lehman College Teacher Training Program	8
III	Average Helpfulness Ratings of Foundation Courses Completed by Respondents	15
IV	Average Helpfulness Rating of Methods Courses in Elementary Education Completed by Elementary School Teachers	16
V	Helpfulness Ratings of Secondary Education Methods Courses by Respondents	17
VI	Helpfulness Ratings of Student Teaching	18
VII	Helpfulness Ratings of Elective Education Courses	19
VIII	Helpfulness of Academic Courses in Elementary School Curriculum	20
IX	Helpfulness Ratings of Groups of Courses in Undergraduate Education Sequence	22
X	Comparison of Distribution of F Ratings by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers for Pre-Student Teaching Experiences	24
XI	Comparison of Total Mean F Scores of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers on Pre-Student Teaching Experiences	25
XII	Comparison of Distribution of V Ratings by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers for Pre-Student Teaching Experiences	27
XIII	Comparison of Total Mean V Scores of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers on Pre-Student Teaching Experiences	28
XIV	Frequency Distribution of F and V Ratings	30

Table	Title	Page
XV	Comparison of Frequency (F) Ratings of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers for Student Teaching Experiences	35
XVI	Comparison of Rank Order of Areas of Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean Frequency (F) Ratings by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	36
XVII	Comparison of Value (V) Ratings of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers for Student Teaching Experiences	38
XVIII	Comparison of Rank Order of Areas of Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean Value (V) Ratings by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	39
XIX	Student Teaching Experiences Rated Most Frequently by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	40
XX	Student Teaching Experiences Rated Most Valuable by Elementary and Secondary School Teachers	42
XXI	Comparison of Rank Order of Areas of Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean F and V Scores of All Teachers	43

EVALUATION OF LEHMAN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM BY TEACHER ALUMNI

The problem of training teachers who can function effectively in the elementary and secondary schools of the greater metropolitan area is the major concern of the Department of Education of Herbert H. Lehman College. To meet this responsibility, the department is reexamining and reevaluating its program in the light of recent developments affecting education. Changes in the New York State requirements for teacher certification, the movement toward structuring education programs in terms of teaching competency and field experiences, the impact of social, economic, and political forces on public education, and the emergence of new approaches and new philosophies of education are among the major factors that must be considered in promulgating teacher training programs that meet the needs of today's schools.

The purpose of this report is to provide evaluative data of the Lehman College undergraduate education program based on the experiences of alumni currently teaching in the schools of greater New York City. Evaluative feedback of this kind is usually supplied informally by random samples of students, alumni, and faculty. In this study, a systematic survey was conducted among teaching alumni. Such data will constitute invaluable input in the effort to update and modernize the teacher training program at Lehman College.

RELATED STUDIES

Reassessing and reorganizing teacher education programs appear to be an ongoing, never-ending activity of education faculties throughout the nation. Recently, a four year survey[1] in which over 600 graduates participated, evaluated the undergraduate teacher education program in a large midwestern university. This study revealed that "graduates thought that a course was of extreme value when method rather than content was emphasized." Student teaching was rated as most valuable; reading methods, media, and science methods were of value in the order given and the least valuable were methods courses in social studies and art. Courses offering assigned actual teaching experiences as part of the course requirements received an extremely valuable rating.

Among the implications growing out of this survey was the necessity of providing extended experiences for pre-student teachers to work directly with students in public school settings starting in the freshman year. Successful experiences with pupils should be one admission requirement to professional education programs. Methods courses should emphasize methods rather than content. The emphasis should be on the "how" rather than "what". Prospective teachers should have assignments with public school pupils. Performance objectives asscciated with pupils are more valuable than traditional lesson plan writing and developing library referenced units of study. Students should not be expected to become carbon copies of cooperating teachers but should have opportunities to try out new ideas.

---

[1] John W. Sanders, Teacher Education Grads Speak Out: Assessment and Implications, August 1973, ERIC-EDO 75380.

The Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio conducted a critical study of teacher education in that state.[1] Questionnaire responses from a random sample of elementary and secondary public school teachers indicated that graduates do not feel particularly competent as a result of their teacher training program. The reasons given were (a) what is taught in these programs has little value for classroom practices, (b) the college setting for teacher education limits what can be taught, and (c) too much is expected in too little time. The majority of teachers indicated that their pre-service training was barely adequate while a fourth assessed it as "totally inadequate."

About three-quarters regarded student teaching as the most beneficial experience and less than one out of ten chose education courses as most beneficial. The major problem with student teaching was that it was "too little too late." Another criticism was that it comes at the wrong time, usually three years after a student has taken his first course in education. Student teaching is further weakened by lack of quality control. Immense variations were found among institutions with respect to what a student teacher is expected to do during his training period and how success is evaluated. The quality of the cooperating teacher also varied greatly.

Based on these findings, the Commission recommended a five-year program for teacher preparation. Also before admission to a teacher education program, a student should complete a special introductory experience which combines the study of education with observations in schools and their communities. This should take place in the sophomore year; its purpose is to aid the applicant in self-selection and also assist teacher training institutions with data for admission into programs of teacher preparation.

---

[1] Realities and Revolution in Teacher Education, Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio, Report No. 6, November, 1972

In another study at Illinois State University,[1] the graduates felt that "there should be earlier and longer exposure to children as part of the teacher preparation experience." The weakest area of preparation was "discipline." Other weak areas were preparation for reading, language, math, and science.

In 1966, the Research Department of the California Teachers' Association[2] sent a questionnaire to a stratified random sample of teachers. Over 2,000 were usable returns (85.9 percent). Among the items in the questionnaires were professional judgments regarding teacher education programs. Most teachers indicated that preservice courses contributed to professional development. Courses in subject matter relating to teaching majors were strongly favored. Methods courses received relatively favorable reactions and courses in philosophy of education were accorded low positions.

---

[1]Thomas Fitch and Kenneth Klima, A Comparative Study of Illinois State University Elementary Teacher Graduate of Regular Student Teaching and the Joliet Teacher Education Center Program, 1970-71, Illinois State University, 1972, ERIC-EDO 75377.

[2]California Teachers' Reactions to Certification and Preservice Courses, Supplement Research Report No. 58, California Teachers' Association, Burlingame, Department of Research, August, 1966, ERIC-EDO 24632.

POPULATION

The population participating in this study consisted of a sample of Lehman College graduates currently teaching in the public schools located in the greater metropolitan area. These teachers had completed the undergraduate teacher training program and had received their baccalaurate degrees since July 1, 1968, the date on which Lehman College became an independent unit of City University of New York (CUNY).

Between 1968-69 and 1971-72, 2,269 Lehman College graduates completed the undergraduate education sequence and were recommended by the Department of Education for state certification as teachers.[1] Annual surveys conducted by the Office of Teacher Education of CUNY[2] concerning the employment status of Lehman College graduates reported the following information which appears in Table I.

TABLE I

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF LEHMAN COLLEGE GRADUATES

Year	Number Received Degree	Number Responded To Survey	Employed In Teaching Positions			
			Total Number	In NYC Public Schools	In Other U.S. Communities	Others*
1968-69	614	564	457	317	89	51
1969-70	559	520	381	264	82	35
1970-71	560	491	272	148	61	63
Total	1733	1575	1110	729	232	149
Percent		90.0	70.5	65.7	20.9	13.4

Source: Annual Employment Status Surveys, Office of Teacher Education, CUNY

[1] Data supplied by Office of Teacher Education of CUNY.

[2] The Employment Status Survey for 1971-72 was not published.

Table I indicates that for the three year period from 1968-69 to 1970-71, 1,733 Lehman College undergraduates completed the education sequence and received their degrees. Over 90.0 percent of these graduates responded to the surveys and of these, 70.5 percent were employed as teachers--65.7 percent in New York City public schools, largely in The Bronx, and 20.9 percent in other New York State communities, chiefly Westchester County.

Although the names and home addresses at the time of graduation of 2,200 graduates qualified to teach were available, it was decided to select a sample of those who were actually teaching in the public schools of The Bronx, Manhattan, Westchester and Rockland Counties. The greatest concentration of Lehman College trained teachers are located in these areas.

The problem was to generate a list of employed teachers to whom a questionnaire could be addressed. To identify and locate such teachers, contact was first made with the superintendents of all school districts in The Bronx and Manhattan, and a sample of school districts in Westchester and Rockland Counties. In January, 1973, letters[1] were sent to 25 district superintendents stating our desire to locate Lehman College graduates currently teaching in their school districts in order to send them a questionnaire for evaluating our teacher training program. A sample set of letters intended for the principals and a copy of the teacher questionnaire were enclosed. The superintendents were asked to encourage the principals and teachers to cooperate with us by publicizing our search for teachers who were Lehman College graduates. The majority of the district superintendents did cooperate and encouraged teacher participation in the study.

---

[1] See Appendix A.

About 300 principals of elementary, junior, and senior high schools in the districts named above received letters[1] which described the evaluation study of the Lehman College teacher training program. In addition, they were asked to send the name and home address of one teacher in the school who had received his or her undergraduate degree from Lehman College after July 1, 1968. A tear-off for recording this information and a self-addressed stamped envelope were provided. Responses were received from over 80.0 percent of the principals, the largest number from The Bronx. In most instances, principals who failed to respond did not have Lehman College graduates on their teaching staff.

The next step was to establish contact with the Lehman College graduate named by the principal. A letter[2] was now sent to such teachers explaining that an evaluation of the Lehman teacher training program was being undertaken and that copies of an evaluation questionnaire had been prepared for distribution to teachers who had completed the education sequence at the college and had received their undergraduate degree from Lehman after July 1, 1968. They were asked to list the names and home addresses of such teachers on the enclosed form and return it to the Office of Educational Research in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

The names and home addresses of Lehman trained teachers were received from 160 schools: 112 elementary, 29 junior high schools, and 19 high schools. The overwhelming number came from The Bronx--92 elementary, 22 junior high, and 10 senior high schools.

---

[1]See Appendix A.

[2]See Appendix A.

Questionnaires and a covering letter[1] with a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to 795 teachers in February, 1973 and a follow-up to non-respondents in March, 1973. A summary of the number of letters sent and the number of responses received is given in Table II.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES EVALUATING LEHMAN COLLEGE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

	Elementary Schools			Junior High Schools			Senior High Schools			Total		
	Sent	Rec	%	Sent	Rec	%	Sent	Rec	%	Sent	Rec	%
Bronx	509	158		98	38		61	22		668	218	32.6
Manhattan	13	6		9	3		9	3		31	12	38.7
Westchester C	35	12		10	4		51	17		96	33	34.4
Total	557	176	31.6	117	45	38.5	121	42	34.7	795	263	33.1

Table II indicates that about one third (33.1 percent) of the teachers answered questionnaires.[2] The number of responses from each of the areas--Bronx, Manhattan, and Westchester County--were not significantly different.[3] Also there was no significant difference between the number of questionnaires sent and received from the three groups of teachers, that is the elementary, junior, and senior high schools.[4]

---

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] 48 questionnaires were excluded either because the respondents were graduated prior to July 1, 1968 or had not completed the undergraduate education sequence at Lehman College.

[3] Chi square value was 0.12 which is not significant.

[4] Chi square value was 1.13 which is not significant.

Development of the Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed to obtain teachers' perceptions and opinions about the Lehman College teacher training program as well as their recommendations for improvement based upon their experiences in the schools.

The content and format of the questionnaire were suggested by an instrument developed and used by the Commission on Public School Personnel Practices in Ohio.[1] A five page draft questionnaire was developed by the Director of the Office of Educational Research with the assistance of several members of the Lehman College Department of Education.

Pilot Study

The draft questionnaire was field tested by mailing it to a sample of elementary and junior high school teachers who completed the undergraduate education sequence and were graduated from Lehman College after July 1, 1968. They were asked to react, anonymously, to the content and format of the instrument and suggest revisions that would improve the questionnaire. Responses were received from more than half, 30 of the 51 teachers who received the questionnaire.

Final Questionnaire

The questionnaire was then revised on the basis of the suggestions and recommendations of the field testing reactions with the assistance of several faculty members. In its revised form the questionnaire was constructed as a six part document, each part on a separate page.[2]

---

[1] Realities and Revolution in Teacher Education, Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio, Report No. 6, November 1972. Copies of the questionnaires were obtained from Dr. Kevin Ryan, head consultant to the Commission, Associate Dean of The Graduate School of Education, The University of Chicago.

[2] Copy of the questionnaire may be found in Appendix B.

Part I sought "Background Information"; this covered such items as teaching experience, nature of school, academic background, and teaching license.

Part II was "Evaluation of Undergraduate Education Sequence." Respondents rated the extent to which each course completed in the undergraduate education sequence was useful in preparing them for effective teaching. A six category "Helpfulness Rating Scale" was used on which 5 represented "extremely," 4 "considerably," 3 "moderately," 2 "little," 1 "virtually none," and X "never took course."

Part III was devoted to the "Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences." Each item was rated twice: (1) on "Frequency (F) Rating Scale" and (2) on "Value (V) Rating Scale." The F scale contained five numerical values ranging from 5 for "very frequent" to 1 "virtually never" and N for "can't rate--never occurred." The V scale is similar to the F scale with a range from 5 for "very valuable" to 1 "of virtually no value" and N "can't rate--never occurred."

Part IV consisted of the "Student Teaching Experience" to be answered only by teachers who completed student teaching at Lehman College. This section probed (a) information about the school in which they student taught and (b) an evaluation of various aspects of the student teaching experience using both an F scale and a V scale ratings as in Part III.

Part V was entitled "Total Preparation--Competencies." It consisted of a list of 26 competencies required for teaching. Respondents evaluated the extent to which the total undergraduate teaching program contributed to the mastery of each competency using a five-point "Mastery Rating Scale" on which 5 was "very high."

Part VI was "Recommendations for Improvement." This section which was open-ended solicited suggestions for improving each area previously covered--the education sequence, field and laboratory experiences, student teaching, and teaching competencies.

PART I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Part I of the Teacher Questionnaire provided professional background information. A summary of the responses follows.

Summary of Background Data

Of the 263 respondents, 17.1 percent were males and 82.9 percent females. More than nine out of ten, 93.2 percent, were classroom teachers who had been teaching an average of 2.8 years at the time of the survey, March, 1973. More than half, 56.3 percent, held provisional licenses and the remainder permanent licenses. The overwhelming majority, 87.9 percent, had regular assignment; the remainder was on a per diem basis. Two-thirds, 66.6 percent, were teaching at the elementary school level and the rest, 33.4 percent, at the secondary level in junior and senior high schools. All were in public schools; 87.5 percent in New York City and 12.5 percent in Westchester County. At the elementary school level, 39.2 percent were in grades 1-6, and 26.3 percent in early childhood. In the junior and senior high schools, the subjects taught most commonly were mathematics, social studies, English, and health education.

About two-thirds, 65.4 percent, of the schools in which they taught had pupil populations predominately from the lower socioeconomic level; over a third, 37.9 percent, of these pupils were bilingual, and 11.7 percent were non-English speaking.

Concerning year of Bachelor's from Lehman College, 2.3 percent graduated in 1968, 28.9 percent in 1969, 25.5 percent in 1970, 25.1 percent in 1971, 16.4 percent in 1972, and 2.0 percent in 1973. The academic majors of the respondents were in 24 different subject areas and represented practically every academic department offering majors at the time they attended Lehman College, the excep-

tions being chemistry and physics. The five most common majors were in English, (37); psychology, (35); history, (33); sociology, (29); and mathematics, (20). They constituted more than half, 58.5 percent, of the majors. Practically all, 93.2 percent, had completed student teaching at Lehman College.

About three-quarters, 72.7 percent, had Bachelor's degrees and 26.8 percent, Master's degrees. Two-thirds, 67.0 percent, were enrolled in post Bachelor's program, 60.8 percent at Lehman College. The majority, 72.7 percent, had both State certification and a New York City license. The remainder was about equally divided between those holding one or the other. Most, 79.9 percent, had passed the regular New York City examination.

Thus, the typical respondent is a regularly appointed classroom teacher, a woman in her third year of teaching in a public school in New York City. She had both City and State certifications. She majored in the social sciences or the humanities at Lehman College where she completed student teaching and was graduated about three years ago. Her present school is in a low socioeconomic area with about one-third bilingual and some non-English speaking pupils. At present she is enrolled in the TEP at Lehman College.

PART II: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION SEQUENCE

The courses offered in the undergraduate elementary and secondary education sequence were evaluated on the basis of their helpfulness in preparing the respondent for effective teaching. A six-point Helpfulness Rating Scale was employed on which 5 was "extremely," 4 "considerably," 3 "moderately," 2 "little," 1 "virtually none," and X for "never took course."

The courses were divided into the following curricular categories: A. Foundations, B. Elementary Methods, C. Secondary Methods, D. Student Teaching, E. Elective, F. Academic: Subject Areas in Elementary School Curriculum, and G. Academic Courses for Secondary schools. In addition, elementary school teachers were asked to respond to the following question:

> "In place of a departmental major or concentration would you have preferred a distribution requirement that covered the subject areas included in the elementary school curriculum"?

A. Foundation Courses

A total of seven different Foundation courses have been offered since September, 1968 by the Department of Education. EDU 209 and EDU 210 were part of the education sequence in 1968 and 1969; they were replaced by EDU 207 and EDU 208 in 1970. EDU 212 and EDU 213 were required courses from September, 1968 to June, 1972. Any freshman entering the college or or after that date had to include these two courses as part of the education sequence; however, since September, 1972, these courses have been electives. EDU 211 is also an elective course which replaced EDU 300 (History of Education) in September, 1972.

The number and percentages of respondents and the average helpfulness ratings by those who completed Foundation courses are summarized in Table III.

TABLE III

AVERAGE HELPFULNESS RATINGS OF
FOUNDATION COURSES COMPLETED BY RESPONDENTS

Course		Completed No.	Completed %	Average Rating	Rank Order
EDU 207	Human Relations	157	59.6	2.41	4
EDU 208	Psych Foundations	187	71.1	2.42	3
EDU 209	Psych Found of Educ I	152	57.7	2.24	5
EDU 210	Psych Found of Educ II	145	55.1	2.22	6
EDU 211	Problems and Issues	85	32.3	2.20	7
EDU 212	Afro-Amer in Urban Sc	94	35.7	2.81	1
EDU 213	Span-Speak Am in Urban Sc	93	35.3	2.80	2
	Total	913	49.5	2.41	
	Average	3.5			

From Table III it is seen that half the respondents completed an average of 3.5 Foundation courses. The greatest number took EDU 208 and the fewest, EDU 211, an elective course. All Foundation courses were rated less than 3, that is, they were regarded as less than "moderately" helpful; the average rating was 2.41 and the range from 2.81 for EDU 212 to 2.41 for EDU 207.

B. Elementary Methods Courses

Of the seven Elementary Method courses listed, all but EDU 327 (Physical Education) were part of the education sequence and required of students preparing to teach in the elementary schools.

The number and percentages of the 175 responding elementary school teachers who completed the Elementary Methods courses and the average helpfulness ratings are posted in Table IV.

TABLE IV

AVERAGE HELPFULNESS RATING OF METHODS COURSES IN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION COMPLETED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Course		Completed No.	Completed %	Average Rating	Rank Order
EDU 321	Reading	168	96.0	2.84	4
EDU 322	Social Sciences	159	90.9	2.59	7
EDU 323	Science	167	95.4	3.00	3
EDU 324	Mathematics	168	96.0	3.46	1
EDU 325	Art	169	96.6	3.11	2
EDU 326	Music	169	96.6	2.70	5
*EDU 327	Physical Education	134	76.6	2.64	6
	Total	1134	93.3	2.92	
	Average	6.5			

*Recommended but not required for students who entered the college in September, 1969.

Table IV shows that over 90.0 percent of the teachers completed an average of 6.5 out of the seven required Elementary Methods courses. With few exceptions, practically all the teachers took Methods courses in reading, social sciences, science, mathematics, art, and music which were part of the education sequence. About three-fourths, 76.6 percent completed the courses in physical education which was recommended but not required for students who entered the college in September, 1969. The average rating was 2.92, or "moderately" helpful. The most helpful was the Methods course in mathematics, followed by art and science, all with ratings of 3.00 or higher. The least helpful was social science with a 2.59 rating.

C. Secondary Education Methods Courses

The professional education requirements for teaching in secondary schools as prescribed by the State of New York are a minimum of 12 credits and completion of college supervised student teaching. Most students meet their requirements by taking EDU 207, 208, one of the 25 courses in the EDU 341-366 Secondary Methods series, and EDU 370 Secondary School Internship (student teaching).

The number of respondents who took a required course in teaching a subject and the optional workshop in secondary education as well as their evaluation of these courses are given in Table V.

TABLE V

HELPFULNESS RATINGS OF SECONDARY EDUCATION METHODS COURSES BY RESPONDENTS

Course		Completed No.	Completed %	Average Rating
EDU 341-366	Teach a Subject in Secondary Sc	*97	36.8	3.11
EDU 369	Sec Sc Workshop	61	23.1	2.91
	Total	158	30.0	3.03

*Although there were 88 secondary school teachers, nine respondents currently teaching in the elementary school completed Methods courses for the secondary schools.

Table V indicates that about one-third of the respondents took a methods course in teaching a subject and a fourth, the workshop. The average rating was 3.03 or "moderately" helpful. The Teaching a Subject course was rated somewhat higher than the Workshop.

D. Student Teaching

Teachers who completed student teaching for elementary schools (EDU 329) and for secondary schools (EDU 370) evaluated their experiences on the Helpfulness Rating Scale. The results are given in Table VI.

TABLE VI

HELPFULNESS RATINGS OF STUDENT TEACHING

Course	Completed No.	Completed %	Average Rating
EDU 329 Supervised Elem Sc Intern	155	58.9	4.28
EDU 370 Supervised Sec Sc Intern	89	33.8	4.20
Total	244	92.7	4.25

Table VI indicates that nine out of ten teachers completed their student teaching experience at Lehman College, more than half in elementary and a third in secondary. This represents 88.6 percent of the 175 elementary school respondents and 100.0 percent of the secondary school teachers. The average rating showed that these courses were "considerably" helpful. Elementary school teachers rated their student teaching experience slightly higher than the secondary school teachers.

E. Elective Courses

In the past four years twelve elective courses have been offered. On the average, a student in the elementary sequence is able to take only one of these electives.

The number of teachers who completed elective courses and their Helpfulness Ratings appears in Table VII.

TABLE VII

HELPFULNESS RATINGS OF ELECTIVE EDUCATION COURSES

Course		Completed No.	Completed %	Average Rating	Rank Order
EDU 300	Philosophy of Ed	59	22.4	1.78	11
EDU 301	History of Ed	41	15.5	1.61	12
EDU 302	Class Group Dynamics	23	8.7	3.14	2
EDU 303	Mental & Ed Testing	8	3.0	2.28	9
EDU 304	Educational Guidance	11	4.1	2.63	5
EDU 305	Vocational Guidance	4	1.5	2.25	8
EDU 306	Teach Eng as a Sec Lang	14	5.3	2.79	4
EDU 309	Sex Education	28	10.6	2.36	7
EDU 310	Educ & Mass Media	10	3.8	3.30	1
EDU 314	Independent Studies	4	1.5	2.50	6
EDU 490	Honors Course	9	3.4	2.89	3
	Total	211	7.2	2.24	
	Average	6.8			

Relatively few teachers took elective courses, as seen in Table VII, less than one out of ten. The higher registers in philosophy and history reflect the enrollment in 1968 and 1969 when these were required courses. The two courses which appeared to have been elected by the respondents more often than the others were Sex Education (EDU 309) taken by 10.6 percent and Group Dynamics (EDU 302) by 8.7 percent. The others were chosen by comparatively few respondents.

The ratings for these elective courses average 2.24 indicating that they had "little" value. The interpretation of individual course rating should take into consideration the number of respondents. For example, EDU 310 was rated highest, 3.30; however, only ten respondents were involved. Group

Dynamics (EDU 302) was rated 3.14 by 23 teachers. On the other hand, EDU 300 (Philosophy of Education) and EDU 301 (History of Education) were rated lowest, 1.78 and 1.61, respectively. This expressed the opinions of largest number of respondents.

F. Academic Courses: Subject Areas in Elementary School Curriculum

In an effort to determine how helpful the academic courses in those subject areas found in the elementary school curriculum, respondents were asked to evaluate art, English and language arts, mathematics, physical education and health, music, social science, and science. The responses of the 175 elementary school teachers are summarized in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

HELPFULNESS OF ACADEMIC COURSES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Area	Respondents No.	Respondents %	Average Rating	Rank
Art	77	44.0	3.12	1
English and Language Arts	95	54.3	2.78	2
Mathematics	97	55.4	2.76	3
Physical Educ and Health	87	49.7	2.32	7
Music	70	40.0	2.43	6
Social Science	94	53.7	2.54	5
Science	93	53.1	2.67	4
Total	613	50.0	2.62	

Table VIII reveals that the average rating for the academic courses in seven subject areas was 2.62, of "little" to "moderately" helpful. Art was rated highest, 3.12, and physical education and health, lowest, 2.32.

The responses by elementary school teachers to the question "In place of a departmental major or concentration would you have preferred a distribution requirement that covered the subject areas included in the elementary school curriculum?" are summarized as follows: of the 175 elementary teachers, 162 or 92.6 percent responded to the question; 54.9 percent said "yes" and 45.1 percent said "no". Slightly more than half preferred a departmental concentration that included subject areas taught in elementary school.

G. Academic Courses: Secondary

The academic courses in the curriculum for teaching in the secondary school were evaluated by 58 junior and senior high school teachers. Their average "helpfulness" rating was 3.76 or from "moderately" to "considerably" helpful.

Summary of Undergraduate Education Sequence

A more global approach to the interpretation of the evaluation of the entire undergraduate education sequence was undertaken by comparing the average helpfulness ratings given to the categories of courses. These data are given in Table IX.

TABLE IX

HELPFULNESS RATINGS OF GROUPS OF COURSES IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION SEQUENCE

Courses	Average Rating	Rank
A. Foundations	2.41	6
B. Elementary Methods	2.92	4
C. Secondary Education Methods	3.03	3
D. Student Teaching	4.25	1
E. Electives	2.24	7
F. Academic--Elementary	2.62	5
G. Academic--Secondary	3.76	2

From Table IX it is evident that Student Teaching both at the elementary and secondary levels was regarded by teachers as the most helpful experiences in the education sequence. For those teaching in secondary schools, the academic courses were of more than moderate helpfulness. The Methods courses on the elementary and secondary levels were of about equal helpfulness. Foundations courses were not rated very high, but the lowest rating was for the Electives.

The fact that student teaching was given the highest ratings by teachers came as no great surprise and the relative high value placed on Methods courses emphasized the high value placed on the practical aspects of teaching. There was less enthusiasm for the Foundations courses which tend to be more theoretical.

PART III: PRE-STUDENT TEACHING FIELD EXPERIENCES

This part of the survey attempted to evaluate the field experiences of students in pre-student teaching courses. Recognizing the importance of field experiences in preparing students for the classroom, several undergraduate courses prior to student teaching include school and community field work as part of the curriculum. After a preliminary survey, a list of the 16 most common field experiences was prepared. Teachers were asked to indicate the frequency of these experiences and also to rate their value in preparing them for teaching. Frequency was measured on a six-point Frequency (F) Scale which ranged from 5 "very frequently," 4 "frequently," etc., to N "never occurred." Value was assessed on a Value (V) Scale with the same intervals: 5 "extremely valuable" to N "never occurred." Thus, each of the experience items was rated twice, for (F) frequency and for (V) value.

The responses of elementary and secondary school teachers on the F and V scales were compared with respect to distribution of ratings mean scores and rank order of the 16 field experiences based on mean rating scores.

Distribution of Frequency (F) Ratings

The distribution of the Frequency (F) ratings of elementary and secondary school teachers for all 16 pre-student teaching experiences were compared. These data are presented in Table X.

TABLE X

COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF F RATINGS
BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
FOR PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

	RATINGS				
	Elementary		Secondary		
F Scale	No.	%	No.	%	Chi Square
5. Very frequent	199	13.0	88	12.2	
4. Frequent	400	26.1	175	24.3	
3. Less frequent	321	20.9	179	24.8	
2. Infrequent	377	24.6	172	23.9	
1. Virtually never	237	15.4	107	14.8	
Total	1534	51.6	721	48.2	7.94[1]
N. Never occurred	1441	48.4	775	51.8	

[1]Not significant.

Table X indicates that there was no significant difference between elementary and secondary school respondents with respect to the distribution of ratings on the six-point F scale. It was noted that about half the ratings, 48.4 percent, of elementary school teachers and slightly more than half, 51.8 percent, of the secondary teacher ratings were N "never occurred." The distribution of ratings for categories 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1, were fairly symmetrical and very similar for the two groups.

The total mean F scores of the two groups of teachers for all 16 pre-student teaching experiences were compared and the results are summarized in Table XI.

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF TOTAL MEAN F SCORES
OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
ON PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Elementary	2.97	1.22	0.37	n.s.
Secondary	2.95	1.23		

As can be seen from Table XI there was no significant difference in the overall mean F scores of the two groups. The total mean ratings were at the midpoint of the distribution, 2.97 for elementary school teachers and 2.95 for secondary school teachers.

The differences between the two groups in the mean F scores on each of the 16 pre-student teaching experiences were also compared and no statistically significant differences were found.[1]

Rank Order of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean F Scores

The rank order of the 16 pre-student teaching experiences among elementary and secondary school teachers was also compared. The rank of each experience in the two groups was determined by mean F scores.[2]

A significant correlation between the two groups with respect to the rank order of the pre-student teaching experiences was found.[3] The frequency with which elementary school teachers as compared to secondary school teachers encountered these experiences was essentially the same. For example,

---

[1] The "t" score was 1.75 which is not significant.

[2] A summary of the rank order of pre-student teaching experiences based on mean F scores is given in Appendix C.

[3] The rank difference correlation coefficient was 0.65 which is significant at the .01 level.

over 85.0 percent of elementary and secondary school teachers had had no experiences "working with paraprofessionals" or "conferences with parents"; 80.0 percent had not "worked in after-school centers," 65.0 percent had not "observed student teachers," 60.0 percent were not "familiar with community agencies," and about 50.0 percent had not "worked in camps, community centers, etc."

The experiences which occurred most frequently for both groups, that is, with the fewest N ratings, were "observing classroom teachers" by 90.0 percent, "working with individual pupils" by about 85.0 percent, and "presenting simulated lessons" by 75.0 percent.

Despite the essential agreement in rank order, there were differences that should be noted. Elementary school teachers ranked first in frequency "working with small groups;" second "seminar with college supervisor;" and third, "working with individual pupils." Secondary teachers placed "conferences with teachers" as most frequent, "working with individual students," and "worked in camps and community centers, etc." as next most frequent. However, as pointed out above over 50.0 percent of the two groups never "worked in camps and community centers."

The greatest difference in F rank was for "conferences with classroom teachers" which secondary teachers ranked first and elementary teachers placed in tenth position. "Working in after school centers" occurred more frequently among elementary than secondary teachers which was ranked fifth and twelfth, respectively, by the two groups.

Distribution of Value (V) Ratings

The paradigm for analyzing the Value (V) ratings pf pre-student teaching experiences by elementary and secondary school teachers paralleled that employed for the Frequency (F) ratings. The distribution of Value (V) ratings of the two groups of teachers for all 16 pre-student teaching experiences were compared and the results are summarized in Table XII.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION OF V RATINGS BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

	RATINGS				
	Elementary		Secondary		
V Scale	No.	%	No.	%	Chi Square
5. Extremely valuable	386	24.9	187	24.6	
4. Of considerable value	429	27.6	217	28.5	
3. Moderately valuable	412	26.5	228	29.9	
2. Of little value	188	12.1	81	10.6	
1. Of virtually no value	138	8.9	49	6.4	
Total	1553	52.2	762	50.9	
N. Can't rate--never occurred	1442	47.8	734	49.1	7.94[1]

[1]Not significant.

Table XII reveals no significant difference between elementary and secondary school teachers in the distribution of V ratings. The greatest number of ratings for both groups was in categories 5 "extremely valuable," 4 "of considerable value," and 3 "moderately valuable." The fewest ratings were in 1 "of virtually no value" followed by 2 "of little value." Slightly less than half of all ratings were N "can't rate--never occurred," 47.8 percent of elementary school teachers and 49.1 percent of secondary school teachers.

The total mean V scores of the two groups for all 16 experiences were also compared and the results have been posted in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

COMPARISON OF TOTAL MEAN V SCORES
OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
ON PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

Groups	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Elementary	3.47	1.23	1.38	n.s.
Secondary	3.54	1.16		

From Table XIII it can be seen that there was no significant difference in mean V scores of elementary as compared to secondary school teachers with respect to total pre-student teaching experiences. The two groups rated these experiences as being between "moderate" and "of considerable" value. In addition, differences in mean V scores between the two groups for each of the 16 pre-student teaching experiences were not significant.[1]

Rank Order of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean V Scores

The value placed on these experiences by elementary and secondary school teachers was compared by assigning a rank order to each item based on mean V scores.[2]

The two groups were in essential agreement in the ranking of the 16 experiences with respect to their value in teacher preparation.[3] The experiences with the greatest number of N's tended to be given the lowest value.

---

[1]The "t" value was 0.08 which is not statistically significant.

[2]A summary of the rank order of pre-student teaching experiences based on mean V scores is given in Appendix C.

[3]The rank difference correlation coefficient was 0.81 which is significant at the .01 level.

For example, "conferences with parents" was rated N by 84.6 percent of the elementary and 73.9 percent of the secondary school teachers and were ranked ten and 15, respectively. "Working with paraprofessionals" rated N by 83.4 percent of elementary and 81.8 percent of secondary school teachers were ranked 8.5 and 11, respectively. The same was true for "observing student teachers," "becoming familiar with community agencies," and "conferences with parents." The only exception appeared to be "working in camps, etc." rated N by 50.3 percent of elementary and 48.9 percent of secondary school teachers but ranked 6.5 and 5, respectively.

The experiences of the greatest value in rank order for elementary school teachers were: 1, "working with small groups;" 2, "working with individual pupils;" 3, "observing classroom teachers;" and 4, "conferences with classroom teachers." Secondary school teachers placed the highest values on these same experiences but gave top rating to "observing classroom teachers," second to "working with small groups," third to "conferences with classroom teachers," and fourth to "working with individual pupils." The greatest difference in V value was for "conferences with parents" which elementary school teachers rated tenth and secondary school teachers fifteenth.

Comparison of Distribution of F and V Ratings for Pre-Student Teaching Experiences

Since there were no significant differences between elementary and secondary school teachers in the frequency of their pre-student field experiences and also in the value of these experiences in preparing them for teaching, the ratings of the two groups were combined for statistical purposes.

Frequency Distribution of F and V Ratings

The distribution of F and V ratings by all respondents is given in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF F AND V RATINGS

Ratings	F Scale No.	F Scale %	V Scale No.	V Scale %
5	287	12.7	573	24.8
4	575	25.2	646	27.9
3	500	22.2	640	27.6
2	549	24.3	269	11.6
1	344	15.3	187	8.1
Total	2255	50.4	2315	51.8
N	2216	49.6	2156	48.2
Mean	2.96		3.50	

Table XIV shows that about half the F ratings and half the V ratings were N's. There were twice as many highest ratings, 5, on the V scale as compared to the F scale, but about half as many '2' and '1' ratings. The mean F rating was about 3, "less frequent" whereas the mean V rating was 3.5, between "moderate" and "of considerable" value.

Rank Order of Pre-Student Teaching Experiences Based on Mean F and V Scores

Each of the 16 pre-student teaching field experiences was ranked twice: first on combined elementary and secondary school teacher mean F scores and second on mean V scores. The rank order of these experiences were then compared for significant differences.[1]

Mean F ratings ranged from 3.35 "working with individual pupils," to 1.93, "working with parents." The experiences which occurred most frequently, in rank order, were: 1, "working with individual pupils;" 2, "seminar with

[1]The mean F and V ratings and the resulting rank order of each of the 16 pre-student experiences are found in Appendix D.

college supervisor;" 3, "working with small groups;" 4, "working in camps, community centers, etc.;" and 5, "observing classroom teachers." Least frequent, in reverse rank order, were 16,"conferences with parents;" 15, "observing student teaching;" 14, "becoming familiar with community agencies;" 13, "seeing fiims or videotapes on teaching metholds;" and 12, "conferences with school supervisors."

Teachers placed the greatest value, 3.98, on "working with small groups of students" and the least value, 2.78, on "seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods." The five most valuable experiences, in rank order were: 1, "working with small groups of students;" 2, "working with individual students;" 3, observing classroom teachers;" 4, "conferences with classroom teachers;" and 5, "working in camps, community centers, etc." Least valuable in reverse rank order were 16, "seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods;" 15, "becoming familiar with community agencies;" 14, "seminars with college supervisor;" 13, "conferences with parents;" and 12, "presenting simulated lessons."

All experiences but one were given higher V than F ratings. The exception was "seminar with college supervisor" whose mean F rating was 3.33 and mean V rating 3.09; the rank order of this item was second on the F scale and fourteenth on the V scale.

Finally, there was a significant correlation in the rank order of these experiences based on mean F ratings and mean V ratings.[1] A strong relationship existed between the frequency of an experience and its value in teacher preparation.

---

[1]The rank difference correlation coefficient was 0.63 which is significant at the .01 level.

Summary of Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences

Elementary and secondary school teachers not only had essentially the same pre-student teaching field experiences, but also agreed on their value in teacher preparation. The most frequent experiences were those which took place in the classrooms such as working with small groups or individual students and observing or having conferences with teachers. These were the experiences rated as most valuable in teacher preparation. Less frequent and of less value, were experiences not directly related to the teaching act, notably activities outside of the classroom such as "conferences with parents," "becoming familiar with community agencies," and "seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods."

There were some notable differences in the experiences of the two groups. For example, the secondary school teachers had "conferences with classroom teachers" more often than elementary school teachers, but had less experience "working in after-school centers." In general, secondary school teachers have more opportunity for conferences since they usually do not have more than five teaching assignments per day.

With respect to value judgments, secondary school teachers saw "simulated lessons" as more valuable than elementary school teachers, but found "conferences with parents" less valuable. Again, this latter difference may reflect the role of high school guidance counselors who have more contacts with parents than the classroom teachers.

Although there was a positive and direct relationship between the frequency and the value of pre-student teaching field experiences, the value of

"seminar with colleg supervisor" was questioned. It ranked second in frequency but fourteenth in value. This divergence raises questions about the role of the college supervisor in these courses and the reasons why students find this experience of relatively little value in teacher preparation.

PART IV: STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

A. School Information

This part of the questionnaire sought responses only from teachers who completed student teaching as part of the educational sequence while undergraduates at Lehman College. Of the 263 respondents, 245 or 93.2 percent met this criterion, two-thirds, 168, at the elementary level and a third, 82, at the secondary level.[1]

Information about their student teaching experiences are summarized as follows: about 80.0 percent of the respondents completed student teaching in 1969, 1970, and 1971. Two-thirds were assigned to the early childhood and elementary grades, N-6; the remainder taught in junior and senior high schools, grades 7-12. Almost all, 98.8 percent, taught in public schools; about two-thirds of the schools, 62.4 percent, were populated by pupils predominantly from lower socioeconomic levels. One out of three pupils, 34.0 percent, were bilingual, and over one out of ten, 13.4 percent, were non-English speaking. More than a third, 38.1 percent, had one student teaching assignment, over half, 54.5 percent, had two, and the remainder more than two assignments.

B. Activities

The second part of the questionnaire listed 42 activities which may have been part of the student teaching experience. These experiences were grouped into the following 12 categories: 1, observing; 2, being observed;

---

[1] Several students completed student teaching at both levels.

3, planning lessons with; 4, conferences with; 5, attending meetings of; 6, working with; 7, teaching; 8, tests; 9, teaching aids; 10, clerical activities; 11, general and 12, seminars with. Subsumed under each category were from two to five activities. Each student teaching activity was evaluated twice on a Frequency Rating Scale and on a Value Rating Scale similar to those employed in Part III for rating pre-student teaching experiences.

The responses of elementary and secondary school teachers were compared for differences in frequency and in value ratings of student teaching activities.

Distribution of Frequency (F) Ratings for Student Teaching Experience

The distribution of the F ratings of elementary and secondary school teachers in the six scale categories were compared; the results are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF FREQUENCY (F) RATINGS OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

	RATINGS				
	Elementary		Secondary		
F scale	No.	%	No.	%	Chi Square
5. Very frequent	973	22.8	514	23.3	
4. Frequent	1171	27.4	546	24.8	
3. Less frequent	965	22.6	558	25.3	
2. Infrequent	766	18.0	380	17.2	
1. Virtually never	392	9.2	206	9.4	
Sub total	4267	62.3	2204	64.0	4.89[1]
N. Never occurred	2579	37.7	1240	36.0	2.71[1]
Total	6846	100.0	3444	100.0	11.78*

[1]Not significant. *Significant at the .05 level.

Table XV reveals that there was no significant difference between elementary and secondary school teachers in the distribution of F ratings for the numerical categories of the scale, namely, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. Also the difference in the distribution of N ratings for the two groups was not statistically significant. However, the distribution of F ratings for all six scale categories was significantly different for the two groups.

Rank Order of Frequency of Student Teaching Experiences by Areas

The 12 areas describing student teaching activities of the elementary and secondary school teachers were placed in rank order based on mean F ratings and then compared for differences. These data are found in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDER OF AREAS OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES BASED ON MEAN FREQUENCY (F) RATINGS BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Elementary		Secondary		Dif. (Elem-Sec)	
Areas	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Observing	3.54	3	3.53	2	+.01	+1
Being observed by	3.20	9	3.24	8.5	-.04	+0.5
Planning lessons with	3.21	8	3.23	10	-.02	-2
Conferences with	3.28	7	3.41	3	-.13	+4
Attending meetings of	2.42	12	2.50	12	-.08	0
Working with	3.73	2	3.35	6	+.38	-4
Teaching	4.14	1	4.14	1	0	0
Tests	3.11	10	3.40	4	-.29	+6
Teaching aids	3.46	4	3.32	7	+.14	-3
Clerical activities	3.08	11	3.19	11	-.11	0
General	3.38	6	3.38	5	0	+1
Seminars with	3.42	5	3.24	8.5	+.18	-3.5
Average	3.37		3.35			

Rank difference correlation coefficient is 0.64 which is significant at the .05 level.

Table XVI indicates that there was a significant correlation between elementary and secondary school teachers in rank order of the areas of student teaching experiences based on mean frequency ratings. The overall averages for the two groups were very close, 3.37 for elementary and 3.35 for secondary school teachers. The greatest differences in mean F scores were for "working with" which was 0.38 higher for elementary school teachers and for "tests," 0.29 higher for secondary school teachers.

Difference in rank order was greatest for "testing;" secondary school teachers placed this area fourth, elementary school teachers relegated it to the tenth position. Secondary school teachers tend to be more involved with tests and testing than elementary school teachers and also have less contact with individual or small groups of pupils, paraprofessionals and school specialists.

The frequency of the student teaching experiences of elementary and secondary school teachers in the twelve areas[1] and for each of the 42 activities[2] were not significantly different.

Distribution of Value (V) Ratings for Student Teaching Experience

The distribution of V ratings of elementary and secondary school teachers in the six categories of the Value scale were compared and the results are summarized in Table XVII.

---

[1]The "t" value was 0.11 which is not significant.

[2]The "t" value was 1.11 which is not significant.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF VALUE (V) RATINGS
OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
FOR STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES

	RATINGS				
	Elementary		Secondary		Chi Square
V Scale	No.	%	No.	%	
5. Extremely valuable	1409	32.7	811	35.9	
4. Of considerable value	1128	26.1	601	26.6	
3. Moderately valuable	1031	23.9	476	21.1	
2. Of little value	406	9.4	211	9.3	
1. Of virtually no value	339	7.9	160	7.1	
Sub total	4313	63.0	2259	65.6	11.20*
N. Can't rate--never occured	2533	37.0	1185	34.4	6.59*
Total	6846	100.0	3444	100.0	23.13**

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.

As presented in Table XVII there was a significant difference between the two groups in the distribution of V ratings in favor of the secondary school teachers. Secondary school teachers thought their student teaching experience was of significantly greater value than the elementary school teachers.

Rank Order of Value of Student Teaching Experiences by Areas

The 12 areas of the student teaching activities of elementary and secondary school teachers were ranked on mean V scores and compared for differences. These data appear in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF R NK ORDER OF AREAS OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES BASED ON MEAN VALUE (V) RATINGS BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Elementary		Secondary		Dif. (Elem-Sec)	
Areas	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Observing	3.86	4	4.10	2	-.24	+2
Being observed by	3.46	9	3.74	9	-.28	0
Planning lessons with	3.68	6	3.98	3	-.30	+3
Conferences with	3.56	8	3.77	8	-.21	0
Attending meetings of	2.77	11	2.80	6	-.03	+5
Working with	4.04	2	3.89	5	+.15	-3
Teaching	4.42	1	4.51	1	-.09	0
Tests	3.57	7	3.78	7	-.21	0
Teaching aids	3.93	3	3.92	4	+.01	-1
Clerical activities	2.52	12	2.66	12	-.14	0
General	3.71	5	3.65	10	+.06	-5
Seminars with	3.27	10	3.38	11	-.21	-1
Average	3.66		3.75			

Rank difference correlation coefficient is 0.78 which is significant at the .01 level.

From Table XVIII it is seen that there was significant agreement between elementary and secondary school teachers in the rank order of 12 areas of student teaching experience based on mean value (V) scores. The two groups agreed in their judgments upon the most valuable experience, "teaching," and the least valuable experience, "clerical." The greatest differences in rank order were for "attending meetings" which elementary school teachers placed eleventh--next to last, and secondary school teachers, sixth; and "general" activities which were ranked fifth by elementary and tenth by secondary school teachers.

An analysis of he significance of the differences in mean V scores of the 12 areas of the student teaching experience revealed that ratings of the secondary school teachers were significantly higher than that of elementary school teachers.[1] A similar analysis of the significance of the differences in mean V scores of all 42 experiences for the two groups was also conducted; here the differences were not significant.[2]

The 11 specific activities receiving the highest mean F ratings from elementary and secondary school teachers were compared in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES RATED MOST FREQUENTLY BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Elementary		Secondary	
Activities	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Observing cooperating teacher	4.58	1	4.56	1
Assisting teacher	4.27	2	4.05	6
General classroom routines	4.14	3	4.12	5
Working with small groups of pupils	4.07	4	3.48	11
Teaching yourself	4.01	5	4.21	2.5
Being observed by cooperating teacher	3.95	6	4.21	2.5
Conferences with cooperating teacher	3.86	7	4.18	4
Working with individual pupils	3.85	8	3.63	9
Teaching aids--preparing learning materials	3.76	9	3.68	8
General school routines	3.66	10	3.51	10
Planning lessons with cooperating teacher	3.55	11	3.77	7

[1]The "t" value was 2.51 which is statistically significant at the .05 level.

[2]The "t" value was 1.49 which is not significant.

Table XIX indicates that the most frequent activity of both elementary and secondary school teachers was "observing cooperating teacher." "Teaching yourself" and "being observed by the cooperating teacher" were the next most frequent experience of the secondary school teachers but elementary teachers rated these activities fifth and sixth, respectively. "Assisting the teacher" and "general classroom routine" were rated second and third by the elementary school teachers. However, these activities were placed in sixth and fifth position, respectively, by the secondary school teachers.

The greatest difference in frequency was "working with small groups of pupils" which ranked fourth by elementary and eleventh by secondary school teachers. At the secondary school level, the teacher usually works with the entire class, rarely with small groups. The activity which took place least frequently was "attending meetings with parents," "special college meetings," "attending meetings of the community" and contact with "school library."

The specific student teaching experiences regarded as most valuable by the two groups of teachers are given in Table XX.

TABLE XX

STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES RATED MOST VALUABLE BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Elementary		Secondary	
Activities	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Teaching yourself	4.63	1	4.75	1
Working with small groups of pupils	4.28	2	4.00	12
Observing cooperating teacher	4.25	3	4.49	2
Assisting teacher	4.22	4	4.24	4
Teaching aids--preparing learning materials	4.13	5	4.19	7
Learning about available teaching aids	4.12	6	4.06	9
Working with individual pupils	4.10	7	4.04	10.5
Using teacher aids	4.05	8	4.04	10.5
Conferences with cooperating teacher	4.01	9	4.27	3
Planning lessons with cooperating teacher	3.96	10	4.21	5.5
Being observed by cooperating teacher	3.91	11	4.21	5.5
Observing other teachers	3.68	15	4.12	8

Table XX reveals that both groups rated "teaching yourself" as the most valuable student teaching experience. "Observing cooperating teacher" and "assisting teacher" were also given high ratings, third and fourth, respectively, by elementary school teachers, and second and fourth by secondary school teachers.

The two groups agreed upon almost all of the ten most valuable. The exception was "working with small groups of pupils" which elementary school teachers rated second most valuable and the secondary school teachers least valuable among the top ten. "Conferences with cooperating teachers" also had different values; elementary school teachers placed it ninth, but secondary school teachers put it in third position.

The least valuable experience was "clerical activities for others" than cooperating teacher, "attending meetings of general faculty," "attending meetings of community," "clerical activities for cooperating teacher," and contact with "school library."

Comparison of Distribution of F and V Ratings for Student Teaching Experiences

The F and V ratings for the student teaching experiences were compared by ranking the twelve areas on the basis of mean F and V scores. Since there was no significant differences between the two groups in rank order, their ratings were combined for statistical convenience. These data are summarized in Table XXI.

TABLE XXI

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDER OF AREAS OF STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES BASED ON MEAN F AND V SCORES OF ALL TEACHERS

	F Scores		V Scores		Dif. (F-V)	
Areas	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Observing	3.54	3	3.95	3	-.41	0
Being observed by	3.22	10	3.57	9	-.35	+1
Planning lessons with	3.22	10	3.79	5	-.57	+5
Conferences with	3.33	8	3.64	8	-.31	0
Attending meetings of	2.46	4	2.78	11	-.32	-7
Working with	3.62	2	4.00	2	-.38	0
Teaching	4.14	1	4.46	1	-.32	0
Tests	3.22	10	3.65	7	-.43	+3
Teaching Aids	3.42	5	3.93	4	-.51	+1
Clerical activities	3.13	12	2.58	12	+.45	0
General	3.39	6	3.70	6	-.31	0
Seminars with	3.37	7	3.31	10	+.06	-3
Average	3.36		3.69			

Rank difference correlation coefficient is 0.67 which is significant at the .01 level.

It can be seen from Table XXI that there is a substantial relationship between the frequency and the value ratings of the 12 areas of the student teaching experiences. Half the areas have exactly the same rank based on mean F and mean V ratings. They were "teaching" which was ranked first; "working with," second; "observing," third; "general" activities, sixth; "conferences with," eighth; and "clerical activities," last.

The mean V ratings were higher than mean F ratings for ten of the 12 areas, the exceptions were "clerical activities" and "seminars." In general, the most frequent and most valuable experiences were related to the classroom--teaching, working with children, and observing. The least frequent and least valuable ratings were for activities not directly part of teaching, i.e., clerical duties. Mean V scores were significantly higher than mean F scores for the 12 areas of student teaching.[1]

---

[1] The "t" value was 3.54 which is significant at the .01 level.

Summary of Student Teaching Experience

The typical respondent taught the elementary grades in a public school located in the Bronx. The school population came predominantly from the lower socioeconomic level where one out of three was bilingual and one out of ten, non-English speaking.

Elementary and secondary school teachers did not differ with respect to mean F scores and rank order of the twelve areas constituting the student teaching experience. However, although the two groups were in essential agreement in the rank order of their student teaching experience, the value ratings of secondary school teachers as compared to elementary school teachers were significantly higher.

Highest F and V ratings were found in areas directly related to the classroom--teaching, working with children, and observing. Less frequent and least valuable were clerical activities. Both in elementary and secondary schools student teachers spent the most time observing cooperating teachers but regarded "teaching yourself" as the most valuable experience. At the elementary level, student teachers were next most frequently involved in "assisting teacher" and "general classroom routine" while those in secondary schools were either "teaching" or "being observed." Apparently student teachers at the secondary level were more frequently involved directly in teaching activities whereas at the elementary level, student teachers helped the cooperating teacher.

The rank order of the student teaching experiences of the two groups combined showed a very high relationship between frequency and value ratings. Half the areas had exactly the same rank, i.e., "teaching" was first, "working with" second, and "clerical activities" last.

PART V: TOTAL PREPARATION--COMPETENCIES

Part V consisted of a list of 26 competencies which are generally considered necessary for successful classroom performance. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the total undergraduate teacher education program contributed to the mastery of each competency listed. Judgments were based on a six-point Mastery Rating Scale on which 5 was "very high," 4 "considerably," etc. to 1, "virtually none," and X "can't judge-no experience."

The ratings of elementary and secondary school teachers were compared by ranking the competencies on the basis of mean mastery scores.[1] The overall mean mastery score was 2.44 for elementary school teachers and 2.38 for secondary school teachers thus indicating that the undergraduate teaching program contributed less than "moderately" to the mastery of the listed competencies. However, the difference in total mean mastery scores was statistically significant.[2] The two groups showed remarkable agreement in the ranking of the 26 teaching competencies.[3]

Elementary school teachers accorded the five highest mastery ratings to "designing lesson plans with distinct objectives" (3.15), "motivating students" (3.13), "classroom management and routines" (2.95), "developing a personal philosophy of education" (2.82), and "developing skills in Interpersonal relations" (2.82). Secondary school teachers gave the five

---

[1] A summary of the rank order of teaching competencies based on the mastery ratings of elementary and secondary school teachers is found in Appendix E.

[2] The "t" value which measures the significance of the differences in mean mastery values of the two groups was 2.36 which is significant at the .05 level.

[3] The rank difference correlation coefficient is 0.93 which is significant beyond the .01 level.

highest mastery rati gs to "designing lesson plans with distinct objectives" (3.15), "motivating students" (3.01), "developing a personal philosophy of education" (2.94), "developing competencies in specific teaching skills" (2.91), and "understanding racial and cultural differences" (2.87). The highest ratings were clustered about "3" which is the middle of the scale indicating that the undergraduate teacher education preparation contributed "moderately" to the mastery of these competencies.

The five competencies receiving the lowest mastery ratings were the same for the two groups with minor variations in their rank order. They were "teaching non-English speaking children," "working with parents," "working with paraprofessionals," "familiarity with and use of community resources," and "preparing films, slides, audiotapes, etc." These ratings were all below "2" which indicated little to virtually no effect on mastery of these competencies.

The mastery ratings of the two groups were combined since there were no significant differences in resulting rank order of the competencies. The overall mean mastery rating was 2.42. The highest mastery ratings were given to those competencies listed above for elementary school teachers and the lowest ratings were those chosen by both groups.

Summary of Total Prep ration--Competencies

The two groups of teachers displayed great congruence with respect to the rank order in which they judged the extent to which the undergraduate education program contributed to the mastery of teaching competencies. Although the overall mastery rating of secondary school teachers was significantly higher than that of elementary school teachers, both agreed that in general, their college experience contributed less than moderately to their competence as teachers.

They agreed upon the competencies for which they were most prepared and least prepared. Their training gave them greatest competency in making lesson plans, motivating pupils, classroom management, teaching skills, and developing a philosophy of education. They were least prepared for teaching non-English speaking pupils; working with parents and paraprofessionals; knowledge and use of community resources; and specific skills in preparing films, slides, audio-tapes, etc. as teaching aids.

PART VI: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The last section of the questionnaire invited suggestions for the improvement of each part of the education program: the Foundation Courses, Methods and Elective Courses, Field and Laboratory Experiences, Student Teaching, Teaching Competencies, and Other Suggestions. The responses of elementary and secondary school teachers to each of these areas are summarized below.

A1. Educational Sequence--Foundation Courses

Reactions to the Foundation courses were received from more than half, 56.5 percent, of the elementary school teachers and 64.1 percent of the secondary school teachers or 56.7 percent of all respondents. The vast majority offered negative reactions to the Foundation courses which were described as "of no value," "not applicable to the classroom," "not relevant," "waste of time," "too much talk," "boring," "impractical," "outdated," "repetitious," and "too much sensitivity." The suggestions for improving these courses included "more field work," "should deal with problems of classroom," "how to deal with minority children," "more emphasis on children's psychology, emotions, and learning disabilities," "should be optional with P/F grading," "preferred EDU 208 because of field experiences," "include a course in tests and measurements," "more remedial reading," and "how to handle emotional and discipline problems." A secondary school teacher felt that the "courses were not geared to the high schools."

A2. Methods and Elective Courses

Reactions were submitted by 56.7 percent of the respondents, 59.6 percent of elementary and 51.1 percent of secondary school teachers. These courses were criticized by the majority on the same basis and for the same reasons as

the Foundation courses, that is, "unrealistic in terms of materials and subject matter," "not geared to urban setting," "no value," and the like. The reading courses were the focus of adverse comment as being badly needed but inadequate and not helpful in diagnosing problems nor in remediation.

The suggestions stressed the inclusion of more field work in the Methods courses as "early as possible," "on the job training," "more demonstration and use of materials with children," "more intensive teaching of reading and math as field work," "exposure to actual classes," "more field experiences in schools and community," and "more remedial courses." However, a few teachers found some of the Methods courses helpful; the science and reading courses were cited specifically. Several secondary school teachers pleaded for the course content to relate more closely to the needs of the high schools.

B. Field and Laboratory Experiences

Recommendations were offered by 58.6 percent of the respondents, 62.6 percent of the elementary and 51.1 percent at the secondary school teachers. The majority of the suggestions focused on an expansion of field experiences to include "more time," "more actual teaching," "observation of existing programs," "more active participation in the schools," "greater involvement with classroom teachers and pupils," "more time to observe experienced teachers," "more time in schools, and less class hours at college," "a greater variety of schools should be observed," "this experience should begin in the sophomore year," "should include conferences with parents, children, and community agencies," "more experience with paraprofessionals," "meetings with teachers, school and district administrators," and "better supervision of field experiences." In general, the suggestion was to increase field experiences by providing more time in schools for observations, teaching,

conferences with parents, teachers, pupils, paraprofessionals, administration and community agencies in a variety of schools at different grade and socio-economic levels.

C. Student Teaching

More than three-quarters, 77.9 percent, of the respondents offered suggestions for improving the student teaching experience, 78.4 percent were elementary school teachers and 79.3 percent, secondary school teachers. The suggestion made most often was that student teaching should be "extended to two semesters, starting the first day of school in September to experience the beginning of school and extended to the last day of school in June." In addition, "It should extend for a full day to experience all the subjects." There should be "more opportunity for actual teaching, assisting, observing, and clerical work." "Cooperating teachers should be carefully screened and more time should be spent with cooperating teacher in planning lessons, supervision, and conferences." The college "supervisor should observe student teachers more often," "have closer contact with school and cooperating teacher," and "better coordination between college and school." Several teachers remarked that their student teaching experience was excellent, the best in the education program.

D. Teaching Competencies

Teachers were asked to suggest competencies which should be added to the list found in Part V. Responses to this section were received from 41.4 percent of the teachers, 42.1 percent at the elementary level and 40.2 percent at the secondary level. In most instances, the respondents repeated the competencies previously listed and made recommendations for realizing them.

About a third said, "there was need for more time to develop competencies" by providing "more field experiences," and an "extension of student teaching" which would enable teachers to learn "how to deal with behavior and discipline problems" generally and with "problems associated with ghetto schools" specifically.

Other competencies emphasized were "instruction and experience with teaching aids," "clerical duties," "teaching of reading," "ability to diagnose and help children with learning disabilities," "planning curriculums," "working with small groups," individualized instruction," "dealing with parents, paraprofessionals, and school administrators," "more college supervisors with teaching experience in elementary and secondary schools," and "a realistic approach to teaching in today's urban schools." Secondary teachers expressed a need for developing competency in teaching reading at the high school level.

E. Other Suggestions

The last portion of Part VI sought overall suggestions including references to academic courses as well as counseling and placement. Reactions were obtained from 42.6 percent of the respondents consisting of 41.5 percent of teachers at the elementary level and 44.6 percent at the secondary level. Generally, most of the responses were a repetition of suggestions made previously in the other parts of this questionnaire. However, a few new suggestions emerged. For example, a considerable number of teachers recommended that "the college offer a major in education," "counseling and placement services be improved," "cooperating teachers be screened," "all education students have some experience in ghetto schools," "the education

sequence begin with field work," "there be more independent study," "prospective teachers be helped in understanding black children and their attitude towards white teachers," "all students be screened to eliminate those unqualified to teach," and "more exposure to health centers and community agencies."

DISCUSSION

The message of teacher alumni was loud and clear--minimize theory and maximize practical field experiences in the teacher education program. They urged that field experiences be introduced as early as possible and as an integral part of all courses and programs in education. The complaint with the foundation and elective courses was they were divorced from reality and therefore failed to adequately prepare them for the classroom. The methods courses were somewhat more school-oriented but the techniques and materials tended to be impractical and inapplicable. Although student teaching was the most valuable experience, it was criticized as being "too little and too late." Furthermore its roots should be in the public school setting and not in the college. Student teaching should be a one year experience and should correspond to the public school year, that is, start the first day of school in September and continue until the last day in June. More careful screening of college supervisors, cooperating teachers, and students entering the program would help to raise the professional level of the program. Many alumni indicated that the college should offer a major in education as a means for professionalizing teaching and at the same time permit greater latitude and flexibility in setting up new programs and extending field experiences and student teaching. The alumni also found that as beginning teachers they knew very little about the community and its resources. The field experience also provided very limited contact with parents, paraprofessionals, school resources, and school administrators.

It should be pointed out that the Department of Education has continuously been in process of instituting changes to strengthen and modernize its teacher training program. Major organizational and curricular innovations are now in progress which include some of the recommendations offered by teacher alumni.

SUMMARY

An evaluation of the undergraduate education sequence by Lehman College teacher alumni was conducted by the Office of Educational Research during the spring, 1973 semester. Data were obtained by means of a six page questionnaire sent to a sample of 800 teachers who had graduated from Lehman College since fall, 1968 and were teaching in public schools located in the Bronx, Manhattan, and Westchester County. Responses were received from a third of these teachers. In the report that follows, a summary consisting of the reactions and recommendations of the respondents is presented.

I. Background Information

Of the 263 respondents, over 80.0 percent were women; nine of the ten were classroom teachers who were completing the third year of teaching. More than half held provisional licenses and the remainder permanent licenses. Almost nine out of ten had regular assignments, the rest were working on a per diem basis. Two-thirds were teaching at the elementary level and one-third at the junior and senior high school level. All were in public schools; almost 90.0 percent in New York City, the rest in Westchester County.

Two out of three teachers taught pupils who came from lower socioeconomic levels; over a third were bilingual and more than one out of ten were non-English speaking.

These alumni majored in 24 different subjects, half in English, psychology, history, sociology, and mathematics. Practically all had completed student teaching at Lehman College.

About three-quarters had Bachelor's degrees and the remainder Master's degrees. Two-thirds were enrolled in the graduate teacher education program at Lehman College. The majority had both state certification and a New York City license.

II. Undergraduate Education Sequence

The courses offered in the undergraduate elementary and secondary education sequence since 1968 were evaluated as to their helpfulness in teacher preparation using a six-point scale in which 5 is "extremely" helpful, 4 "considerably," 3 "moderately," 2 "little," 1 "virtually none," and X "never took course." The courses were arranged in seven categories: foundations, elementary methods, secondary methods, student teaching, electives, academic courses for elementary, and academic courses for secondary schools.

The most helpful experience was student teaching. Secondary teachers judged their academic courses helpful, more so than their methods courses. Elementary teachers found the methods courses of greater value than the academic courses. Foundations courses were rated lower and the electives were accorded the lowest ratings.

III. Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences

The 16 activities most often found in the pre-student teaching experience were rated first with respect to the frequency with which they took place and then their value in teacher preparation. Frequency was rated on an "F" scale which ranged from 5 "very frequent" to 1 "virtually never" and N "never occurred." Value was measured on a V scale with the same numerations as the F scale.

Since there were no significant differences between elementary and secondary school teachers on the F and V scales, the two groups were combined for statistical purposes.

The highest ranks based on mean F scores were given to 1 "working with individual students," 2 "seminar with college supervisors," and 3 "working with small groups." Highest V ranks went to 1 "working with small groups," 2 "working with individual students," and 3 "observing classroom teachers." Least frequent were "conferences with parents," "observing student teachers," and "becoming familiar with community agencies." Least valuable were "seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods," "becoming familiar with community agencies," and "seminar with college supervisor." It should be noted that this last item was ranked second in frequency but fourteenth in value. Finally there was a positive correlation between the rank order of the 16 activities on the F and V scales showing a definite relationship between how frequent and how valuable these activities were in teacher preparation.

IV. Student Teaching Experience

This part of the survey was answered only by those teachers who had completed student teaching as part of the Lehman College education sequence. Information about their student teaching experiences revealed two-thirds were assigned to elementary schools and one-third to junior and senior high schools. The student population in two out of three schools came from predominantly lower socioeconomic levels, one-third were bilingual and over 10.0 percent were non-English speaking.

The second part of the questionnaire listed 42 activities usually associated with student teaching which were grouped into 12 categories. Teachers

rated each of these activities on a Frequency (F) and a Value (V) scale similar to those found in the previous section.

There were no significant differences between elementary and secondary school teachers with respect to mean F rating and in rank order of the 12 categories of student teaching experiences. However, secondary school teachers placed greater value of their student teaching experiences by categories than elementary school teachers but were in essential agreement in ranking these student teaching experiences.

The highest F and V ratings were given to activities directly related to the classroom--teaching, working with children, and observing. Least frequent and least valuable were clerical activities.

As student teachers at elementary and secondary levels, they spent the most time observing cooperating teachers but agreed that "teaching yourself" was the most valuable experience. The next most frequent activities of student teachers at the elementary level were assisting teachers and general classroom routines; at the secondary level, teaching or being observed.

V. Total Preparation--Competencies

This portion of the questionnaire presented a list of 26 competencies generally considered important for successful classroom performance. Teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which the total undergraduate teacher education program contributed to the mastery of each competency. Judgments were made on a six-point Mastery Rating Scale with a range from 5 for "very high" to 1 for "virtually none" and X for "can't judge-no experience."

Although the overall mean mastery rating was significantly higher for secondary teachers, scores for both groups indicated that their college

experiences had contributed less than moderately to the mastery of these competencies. In general, they agreed upon those competencies for which they were best prepared and most poorly prepared. Their training gave them greatest competency in making lesson plans, motivating pupils, classroom management, teaching skills, and developing a philosophy of education. They felt least prepared for teaching non-English speaking pupils, working with parents and paraprofessionals, knowledge and use of community resources, and specific skills in preparation and use of teaching aides such as films, slides, etc.

VI. Recommendations for Improvement

The last part of the questionnaire invited suggestions for improving the teacher education program. The following is a summary of the recommendations for improvement for each aspect of the education sequence submitted by more than half the respondents:

A1. Foundation Courses

In general, foundation courses were described as having little or no value, waste of time, boring, too much talk, not relevant and not applicable to the classroom. More field work, more contact with the schools, how to deal with minority children, more emphasis on reading and reading disabilities, and how to handle emotional and discipline problems were among the recommendations. The field experience in EDU 208 was preferred.

A2. Methods and Elective Courses

These courses were criticized by the majority of the teachers on the same basis and for the same reasons as the foundation courses. The reading courses were the main target of criticism as being badly needed but not helpful in diagnosing problems and remediation. The suggestions stressed more field work as early as possible, on the job training, more

exposure to actual classes, and more remedial courses. Science and reading courses were mentioned specifically as helpful by some teachers.

B. Field and Laboratory Experiences

The majority of respondents suggested an expansion of field experiences by giving more time, more teaching, observing existing programs, more actual participation in the schools, greater involvement with classroom teachers and pupils, more time in schools and less in college, and by starting field experiences in the sophomore year. Conferences with parents; working with paraprofessionals, children, and community agencies; meetings with teachers, school and district administrators; and better supervision should be included as part of the experiences.

C. Student Teaching

Almost 80.0 percent of the teachers offered suggestions for improving student teaching. Most teachers felt that this experience should be broadened by extending it for two semesters. It should start the first day of public school and extend to the last day in June and it should be a full day to experience all the subjects in the curriculum.

In addition, it was recommended that there be more opportunity for actual teaching, assisting, observing, and clerical work. Cooperating teachers should be more carefully screened and more time be provided for planning, supervision, and conferences. College supervisors should observe student teachers more often and have closer contact with the school and cooperating teachers.

D. Teaching Competencies

Over 40.0 percent of the teachers reacted to the request to add to the list of teaching competencies. In most instances the suggestions were either a repetition of those already listed or ways to implement them.

About a third said that there was need for more time to develop competencies by providing more field experiences and extending student teaching; this would enable teachers to learn how to deal with behavior and discipline problems associated with ghetto schools.

E. Other Suggestions

Generally, the other suggestions were made in the previous parts of the questionnaire. A few new suggestions emerged. A considerable number recommended that the college offer a major in education, counseling and placement services be improved, cooperating teachers be screened, all students have some experience in ghetto schools, the education sequence begin with field work, independent study be encouraged, all students be screened to eliminate those unfit to teach, and more exposure to health centers and community agencies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations that follow are an amalgam of feedback from teacher alumni, school administrators, college faculty, and ideas culled from the literature on teacher education. Some of the recommendations are currently being implemented, others are still on the drawing board, and still others have yet to be discussed and considered by the various groups of school and college personnel who have accepted the responsibility of improving the quality of teacher education.

I. Concentration in Education

A serious constraint in structuring and implementing field based teacher training programs and experiences is the lack of a concentration (major) in elementary education. Students in elementary education carry a double concentration, one in education and a second in a liberal arts area. Under these circumstances, it is very difficult to program students for extended field based experiences and student teaching. Admittedly, prospective teachers should have a liberal arts background but this should be integrated with their professional preparation as teachers.

II. Introductory Education Experience

Prior to admission to the education program, all students should be exposed to an introductory education experience as early as feasible, possibly in the sophomore year. This experience should be planned to provide applicants with the opportunity to determine their capacity to work with children, emotional maturity and stability, and commitment to teaching. A variety of schools including inner city institutions at various grade levels will assist the

applicants to make intelligent decisions about teaching as a career and also make available data for institutional decisions about candidates entrance into a teacher training program.

III. College-School Collaboration

The success of mounting realistic and effective professional programs depends upon the degree of cooperation and collaboration between the colleges and the schools. Considerable movement in this direction has been made in the past year. Constellations of teacher educators consisting of college faculty and school personnel of some districts are being developed to share responsibility and decision making to improve the instruction and training of pre-service teachers. Greatest progress has been achievement to the development of school administrators to share in supervision and evaluation of student teachers at the elementary level.* There is need for similar constellations at the junior and senior high school levels.

IV. Field Experiences in Foundation Courses

At present two foundation courses, EDU 207 (Human Relations) and EDU 208 (Psychological Foundation of Education) require a "minimum of 15 hours practicum experience in an appropriate setting." These field experiences could be strengthened by closer supervision clarifying objectives and systematic evaluation. Closer liaison between the college, the schools, and the community, and agreement upon specific competencies to be acquired by these experiences, would add to the importance and values of field experiences.

V. Field Experiences in Methods Courses

Most methods courses provide opportunities for field experiences. However, these experiences vary considerably both qualitatively and quantitatively.

*Field Associates Program for Districts 10 and 11.

Perhaps combining methods courses with student teaching in a school setting would help to establish a more efficient professional sequence. This recommendation has been implemented experimentally in several education programs at other units of CUNY.

VI. Student Teaching

Students, faculties, and alumni agree that student teaching is the most valuable experience in the teacher training program. They also concur on measures to improve this experience. The recommendations urge that student teaching be scheduled for one year starting from the first day of school and continuing to the last day of the school year. The current practice of assigning students on the basis of the college semester deprives them of invaluable experiences associated with the opening and closing of the school. Also, it is important that students spend full days in the schools to explore the total teaching experience including contacts in the teacher lounges, lunchrooms, special committees, and faculty meetings.

By expanding the student teaching experience, it becomes possible to integrate the methods courses and make them more functional and realistic. It also appears appropriate at this time to consider more rigorous standards and criteria in selection of candidates who are permitted to enroll in student teaching. More care in screening the college and school personnel involved in student teaching should also be considered. The possibility of establishing teaching training centers in the schools where the college and school personnel can collaborate and cooperate should also be considered.

VII. Secondary Education

To meet New York State and New York City certification requirements for teaching in secondary schools, students must complete student teaching, a

methods course in a secondary school subject, a course in human relations, another in methods of teaching prevention of drug and alcohol abuse in addition to required courses in an area of concentration. This program of professional training of secondary school teachers is in line for reevaluation in the light of the current needs of secondary school students in New York City.

Some thought should be given to developing courses and programs of remediation particulary in the basic skills--the three R's--reading, writing, and arithmetic. There is an obvious omission of such courses to train secondary teachers to deal with educational retardation particularly in reading, a major problem in the high schools today. Closer cooperation between the high schools and the colleges in meeting this educational problem is strongly suggested. It also appears that combining the secondary methods courses with student teaching is practical and feasible and steps to integrate these courses should be initiated as soon as possible.

VIII. Five-Year Teacher Training Program

The national trend appears to be in the direction of developing five-year programs of teacher education which combines bachelors and masters study. This plan fosters the integration of undergraduate and graduate programs of professional training as a continuum. It also allows the integration of theory and practice by combining college study with school and community experiences. The liberal arts component is a necessary and important aspect of a teacher's education. However, it is suggested that liberal arts program be reexamined and perhaps reorganized with a view toward extending and strengthening the professional training of teachers.

IX. Competency Based Teacher Education

In the past year, some progress has been made toward defining the specific teacher competencies (knowledges, skills, and attitudes) required in various areas of education and developing curricula that would provide experiences for developing these competencies. It is recommended that the section of this study relating to competencies be brought to the attention of the department curricular committees and the area committees as input in their deliberations.

X. Sixth Year Teacher Training Program

Although this study is limited to an evaluation of the undergraduate education program, there are implications for the development of a sixth year program for the training of specialists, supervisors and administrators. The Field Associates Program for Districts 10 and 11 are examples of prototypes for such post-Masters programs and the experiences gained might be utilized in the further expansion of sixth year programs.

XI. Teacher Training Programs

Finally, it is recommended that separate teacher preparation programs for early childhood (N-2), elementary (3-6), intermediate (6-9), and secondary (9-12) be considered. Each of these programs should be a sequenced, integrated series of field centered and college based activities. In addition, there should be opportunities for alternative programs some of which could be individualized or a self determined studies curriculum tailored to the ability, interests, and needs of the prospective teachers.

There is considerable merit in planning these programs as unified, total experiences rather than a series of separate, discrete, disparate courses.

The format and experiences of previous experimental pilot programs should not be disregarded but should be studied to determine their adaptability and appropriateness for new programs.

XII. Further Studies

Finally, it is recommended that an evaluative study of the graduate education program as a supplement to the current study be undertaken as well as studies of existing experimental programs in education.

APPENDICES

A	LETTERS
B	EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
C	TABLE
D	TABLE
E	TABLE

APPENDIX A

LETTERS TO DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND ALUMNI

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BEDFORD PARK BOULEVARD WEST
BRONX, NEW YORK 10468

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN — [212] 960-8168
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE — [212] 960-8167
TEP GRADUATE OFFICE — [212] 960-8171
STUDENT TEACHING AND FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE — [212] 960-8569

January 3, 1972

Dear District Superindent:

Please find enclosed a set of letters being sent to a sample of principals and teachers for the purpose of identifying graduates of Lehman College currently teaching in your school district. These teachers will receive a questionnaire designed to evaluate the teacher training program at the college for purposes of making it more effective.

We would appreciate any help you can offer in locating our graduates and encouraging them to participate in this evaluation. Perhaps, if you have a bulletin, an announcement could be made of the study and that Dr. Edward Frankel, Director of Educational Research at Lehman College can be contacted for further information and materials at 212-960-8591.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Edward Frankel

Edward Frankel
Director

EF:jw
enc:

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BEDFORD PARK BOULEVARD WEST
BRONX, NEW YORK 10468

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN — [212] 960-8168
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE — [212] 960-8167
TEP GRADUATE OFFICE — [212] 960-8171
STUDENT TEACHING AND FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE — [212] 960-8569

January 5, 1973

Dear Principal:

The Department of Education of Lehman College is undertaking an evaluation of its teacher training program for purposes of updating and making it more effective.

We would like only current teachers in your school, who received their undergraduate degree at Lehman College after July 1, 1968 regardless of date of entrance to the college, to respond to the questionnaire being prepared for this purpose. We need your help in locating these teachers. Will you please cooperate by asking one of your teachers who is a Lehman graduate to help us collect the names and addresses of the other Lehman graduates in your school. Please give to the teacher you select the self addressed envelope which contains the form for recording Lehman College Graduates Now Teaching.

It would be most helpful if you would record, on the form below, the name of the Lehman graduate who will assist in collecting the names and addresses of the other Lehman graduates. Please detach the form below and after completion, return it in the enclosed self addressed envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation. For further information contact Dr. Frankel at 212 960-8591.

Respectfully yours,

Edward Frankel
Director, Educational Research

Detach here.

The Lehman College graduate who will collect the names and addresses of the teachers who are Lehman graduates is

_____ _____
Last name, first (print) date

_____ _____
Home address Boro or town zip phone

_____ _____
School Principal or Representative

Please return to Dr. Edward Frankel, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bedford Park Boulevard West, Bronx, New York 10468 no later than January 15, 1973.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BEDFORD PARK BOULEVARD WEST
BRONX, NEW YORK 10468

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN — [212] 960-8168
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE — [212] 960-8167
TEP GRADUATE OFFICE — [212] 960-8171
STUDENT TEACHING AND FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE — [212] 960-8569

January 5, 1973

Dear Lehman College Graduate:

The Department of Education at Lehman College is in the process of updating its teacher training program. A questionnaire is being prepared which will be distributed to teachers who completed the education sequence and received their undergraduate degree at Lehman College after July 1, 1968 regardless of date of entrance to the college.

The purpose of this survey is to get feedback on the teacher training program at the College.

Will you please list on the enclosed form and return it to me no later than January 31, 1973, the names and home addresses of teachers who completed the education sequence and received their undergraduate degrees from Lehman College.

Thank you for your cooperation. Contact Dr. Edward Frankel for further information. Please use enclosed self addressed envelope for returning form(s) below.

Detach here.

January 5, 1973

LEHMAN COLLEGE GRADUATES NOW TEACHING

School _____ District _____ Boro or Town _____

	Name (Print Last Name First)	Home Address	Boro or Town	Zip
1.				
2.				
3.				
4				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

Please turn in this list no later than January 31, 1973 to Dr. Edward Frankel, Herbert H. Lehman College, Bedford Park Boulevard West, Bronx, New York 10468. Telephone - 212 960-8591

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BEDFORD PARK BOULEVARD WEST
BRONX, NEW YORK 10468

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN — [212] 960-8168
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE — [212] 960-8167
TEP GRADUATE OFFICE — [212] 960-8171
STUDENT TEACHING AND FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE — [212] 960-8569

February 14, 1973

Dear Colleague and Lehman College Graduate:

In the process of evaluating its teacher training program, the Department of Education of Lehman College is asking a sample of graduates who completed the education sequence and received their undergraduate degree at Lehman College since July 1, 1968 to complete a questionnaire.

We would like your help in testing the content and format of this questionnaire as well as the benefit of your responses.

Will you please do the following:

First, complete the postage-paid, self-addressed questionnaire so that we may have your reactions to the education sequence and recommendations for improving it.

Then, on the face of the questionnaire, (or on a separate sheet of paper) make any revisions in content which you think will make them more revelant and meaningful and also any suggested changes in format to facilitate answering the questions.

Feel free to delete questions which you think are unnecessary and to add questions where you think they are necessary to give us a more complete picture.

Note that responses are anonymous. Please return the questionnaire to me no later than February 28, 1973. If you have any questions, call me, Dr. Edward Frankel (960-8591) at Lehman College. I will be happy to help you help us.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Frankel

Edward Frankel
Director, Office of Educational Research

EF:rs

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BEDFORD PARK BOULEVARD-WEST
BRONX, NEW YORK 10468

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN — [212] 960-8168
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE — [212] 960-8167
TEP GRADUATE OFFICE — [212] 960-8171
STUDENT TEACHING AND FIELD EXPERIENCE OFFICE — [212] 960-8569

March 26, 1973

Dear Colleague and Lehman College Graduate:

The Department of Education of Herbert H. Lehman College is in the process of reevaluating and updating its undergraduate teacher training program. To do this properly, we need your help as a teacher who completed the educational sequence and received your undergraduate degree at Lehman College since July 1, 1968.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to obtain your evaluation of the courses and experiences offered in the Lehman undergraduate education sequence, as well as your suggestions for improving the teacher training program. From your answers, we hope to determine how useful the courses, internship and field-work experiences were in preparing you to teach, how they can be improved, and new areas of study which should be integrated into our program.

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed postage pre-paid envelope no later than May 1, 1973. For further information, contact me, Dr. Edward Frankel, at Lehman College, telephone number 212 960-8591.

Sincerely, awaiting your reply!

Edward Frankel
Director, Educational Research

EF:rs
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT:

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

HERBERT H. LEHMAN COLLEGE
Department of Education
Bedford Park Boulevard West
Bronx, New York 10468

Office of Educational Research

Dr. Edward Frankel, Director

April, 1973

EVALUATION OF LEHMAN COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: Background Information

Please check appropriate space or fill in blanks as required.

Date_____

1. SEX: M___ F___ 2. POSITION: Classroom Teacher___ Other_____

3. NO. OF YEARS IN TEACHING:_____ 4. CERTIFICATION: Provisional___ Permanent___

5. ASSIGNMENT: Regular___ Per diem___

6. LEVEL: Elementary___ Jr. H. S. or I.S.___

Sr. H. S.: Academic___ Vocational___ Comprehensive___

7. SETTING: Public___ Private___ Parochial___

8. LOCATION: Borough or City_____ District_____

9. GRADE NOW TEACHING_____ If Jr.H.S., I.S., or Sr.H.S., SUBJECTS you teach_____

10. SCHOOL: Predominant SOCIOECONOMIC LEVEL: Lower__ Middle and above__ Mixed__

11. SCHOOL: Percent. of BILINGUAL pupils___ 12. Percent. of NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING pupils___

13. COLLEGE: Year of BACHELOR'S from Lehman____

14. ACADEMIC MAJOR(S):_____

15. STUDENT TEACHING at Lehman: Yes___ No___

16. Highest DEGREE earned:_____

17. Now enrolled in POST-BACHELOR'S program? Yes___ No___

18. If enrolled, name INSTITUTION_____

19. LICENSE and/or CERTIFICATION: New York State Certificate___ New York City License___

20. LICENSED through: Regular N.Y.C. Exam___ Intensive Teacher Training Program___

N.Y.C. Emergency Per Diem Exam___ National Teacher Exam___

Other_____

Undergraduate Education Program - 2

PART II: Evaluation of Undergraduate Education Sequence

The courses offered in the undergraduate elementary and secondary education sequences at Lehman College are listed below. To the left of each course indicate your judgment as to the extent to which each course was useful in preparing you for effective teaching. Use the numbers in the following rating scale and be sure to rate every course listed.

HELPFULNESS RATING SCALE

5	4	3	2	1	X
extremely	considerably	moderately	little	virtually none	never took course

A. FOUNDATIONS COURSES (Undergraduate)

___ EDU 207 Human Relations
___ EDU 208 Psychological Foundations
___ EDU 211 Problems and Issues in Ed.
___ EDU 212 Afro-American in Urban School Setting
___ EDU 213 Spanish-Speaking American in Urban School Setting
___ EDU 209 Psych. Foundations of Educ. I
___ EDU 210 Psych. Foundations of Educ. II

B. ELEMENTARY METHODS COURSES (Undergraduate)

___ EDU 321 Reading
___ EDU 322 Social Sciences
___ EDU 323 Science
___ EDU 324 Mathematics
___ EDU 325 Art
___ EDU 326 Music
___ EDU 327 Physical Education

C. SECONDARY EDUCATION METHODS COURSES (Undergraduate)

___ EDU 341-366 Teaching a Subject in Secondary School

Subject(s) _____

___ EDU 369 Secondary School Workshop

D. STUDENT TEACHING (Undergraduate)

___ EDU 329 Supervised Elementary School Internship
___ EDU 370 Supervised Secondary School Internship _____ subject(s)

E. ELECTIVE COURSES (Undergraduate)

___ EDU 300 Philosophy of Education
___ EDU 301 History of Education
___ EDU 302 Classroom Group Dynamics
___ EDU 303 Mental and Educational Testing
___ EDU 304 Educational Guidance
___ EDU 305 Vocational Guidance
___ EDU 306 Teaching English as a Second Language
___ EDU 309 Sex Education
___ EDU 310 Education and Mass Media
___ EDU 314 Independent Studies
___ EDU 490 Honors Course

F. ACADEMIC COURSES: Subject Areas in ELEMENTARY School Curriculum

___ Art
___ English and Language Arts
___ Mathematics
___ Phys. Educ. and Health
___ Music
___ Social Science
___ Science

In place of a departmental major or concentration would you have preferred a distribution requirement that covered the subject areas included in the elementary school curriculum?

Yes___ No___

G. ACADEMIC COURSES: SECONDARY

___ Courses in your major, _____ (specify)

PART III: Pre-Student Teaching Field Experiences

Below are listed a number of activities that may have been part of your undergraduate field or laboratory experience. In Column F next to each item indicate the frequency with which you engaged in the experience, using the scale marked F. In Column V next to each item indicate your judgment as to how valuable the experience was in preparing you for teaching, using the scale marked V.

FREQUENCY RATING SCALE (F)

5. Very frequent
4. Frequent
3. Less frequent
2. Infrequent
1. Virtually never
N. Never occurred

VALUE RATING SCALE (V)

5. Extremely valuable
4. Of considerable value
3. Moderately valuable
2. Of little value
1. Of virtually no value
N. Can't rate--never occurred

Columns F	Columns V	
__	__	1. Observing classroom teachers
__	__	2. Observing student teachers
__	__	3. Becoming familiar with community agencies
__	__	4. Presenting simulated lessons
__	__	5. Conferences with classroom teachers
__	__	6. Conferences with school supervisors
__	__	7. Conferences with parents
__	__	8. Conferences with students
__	__	9. Seminar with college supervisor
__	__	10. Working with individual students
__	__	11. Working with small groups of students
__	__	12. Working in camps, community centers, etc.
__	__	13. Working in after-school centers
__	__	14. Seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods
__	__	15. Microteaching or practice teaching sessions in a school
__	__	16. Working with paraprofessionals
__	__	17. Others _____

PART IV: Student Teaching Experience

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY TEACHERS WHO TOOK STUDENT TEACHING AT LEHMAN COLLEGE*

A. School Information

1. When did you take student teaching: Fall___ Spring___ 19___
2. Assignment(s): Early Childhood__ Elementary__ Jr.H.S. or I.S.__ Academic Sr.H.S.__ Vocational Sr.H.S.__ Comprehensive H.S.__ Others_____
3. Public__ Private__ Parochial__ 4. Borough or City_____ District_____
5. Grade taught: Elem___ If Jr.H.S., I.S., or Sr.H.S., subjects taught_____
6. Predominant socioeconomic level of pupils: Lower__ Middle and above__ Mixed__
7. Percentage of bilingual pupils_____ 8. Percentage of non-English speaking pupils____
9. Number of Assignments: one___ two___ more than two___

*If you had more than one student teaching assignment, base your responses either on the school in which you spent most of your time or on an average of the assignments.

PART IV: Student Teaching Experience (continued)

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY BY TEACHERS WHO TOOK STUDENT TEACHING AT LEHMAN COLLEGE

B. Activities

Below are listed a number of activities that may have been part of your student teaching experience. In Column F next to each item indicate the frequency with which you engaged in the experience, using the Frequency Rating Scale (F). In Column V next to each item indicate how valuable the experience was in preparing you for teaching, using the Value Rating Scale (V).

FREQUENCY RATING SCALE (F)

5. Very frequent
4. Frequent
3. Less frequent
2. Infrequent
1. Virtually never
N. Never occurred

VALUE RATING SCALE (V)

5. Extremely valuable
4. Of considerable value
3. Moderately valuable
2. Of little value
1. Of virtually no value
N. Can't rate-never occurred

Columns F	Columns V		Columns F	Columns V		Columns F	Columns V	
		Observing						
__	__	1. Cooperating teacher	__	__	18. Community	__	__	32. Using teaching aids
__	__	2. Other teachers	__	__	19. Special college meetings	__	__	33. Curriculum bulletin
__	__	3. Student teachers (peers)			Working with			Clerical activities
		Being observed by	__	__	20. Individual pupils	__	__	34. For coop. teacher
__	__	4. Cooperating teacher	__	__	21. Small groups of pupils	__	__	35. For others
__	__	5. Other teachers	__	__	22. Paraprofessionals			General
__	__	6. Peers	__	__	23. Specialists in school	__	__	36. Classroom routines
__	__	7. College supervisor			Teaching	__	__	37. School routines
		Planning lessons with	__	__	24. Yourself	__	__	38. Special services
__	__	8. Cooperating teacher	__	__	25. Assisting teacher	__	__	39. School library
__	__	9. Other teachers			Tests	__	__	40. Pupil records
__	__	10. Peers	__	__	26. Preparing			Seminars with
		Conferences with	__	__	27. Administering	__	__	41. College supervisor
__	__	11. Cooperating teacher	__	__	28. Marking	__	__	42. Others _____
__	__	12. Other teachers	__	__	29. Analyzing			
__	__	13. College supervisors			Teaching Aids			
__	__	14. Parents	__	__	30. Preparing learning materials			
		Attending meetings of	__	__	31. Learning about available teaching aids			
__	__	15. Grade or department						
__	__	16. General faculty						
__	__	17. Parents						

PART V: Total Preparation--Competencies

A number of competencies required in teaching are listed below. Taking into account all phases of your undergraduate teacher education program, including courses, field experiences, and student teaching, indicate your judgment as to extent to which your preparation contributed to a mastery of each of the listed competencies, using the following rating scale.

MASTERY RATING SCALE

5	4	3	2	1	X
very high	considerably	moderately	little	virtually none	can't judge-no experience

___ 1. Understanding the school as a social institution
___ 2. Developing a personal philosophy of education
___ 3. Developing long-range educational objectives
___ 4. Motivating students
___ 5. Developing skills in interpersonal relations
___ 6. Classroom management and routines
___ 7. Coping with behavior problems in the classroom
___ 8. Counseling students in your classes
___ 9. Understanding learning theory as applied to classroom teaching
___ 10. Designing lesson plans with distinct objectives
___ 11. Developing competencies in specific teaching skills
___ 12. Leading class discussions
___ 13. Individualizing instruction
___ 14. Identifying learning difficulties
___ 15. Identifying emotional difficulties
___ 16. Applying effective tests for evaluating student readiness and progress
___ 17. Teaching non-English speaking children
___ 18. Understanding racial and cultural differences
___ 19. Using instructional media, films, transparencies, etc.
___ 20. Preparing films, slides, audiotapes, etc.
___ 21. Working with parents
___ 22. Working with paraprofessionals
___ 23. Understanding and utilizing research literature
___ 24. Developing an enthusiasm for continuing professional growth
___ 25. Familiarity with and use of community resources
___ 26. Understanding developmental capabilities and problems of children

PART VI: Recommendations for Improvement

As you review the courses, field experiences, and student teaching that comprised your undergraduate teacher education program, you undoubtedly have suggestions for improvement. Kindly record your recommendations as fully as possible. If necessary, use the reverse side of this sheet.

A. Educational Sequence: (Refer to Part II.) Are there special areas or course content that you feel were lacking in your teacher preparation? Where possible, please refer to courses by EDU number as listed in Part II.

1. Foundation courses

2. Methods and elective courses

B. Field and Laboratory Experiences: (Refer to Part III.) How can existing field and lab experiences be improved? What other kinds of experiences should be added?

C. Student Teaching: (Refer to Part IV.) Whether or not you student taught at Lehman, please specify aspects of your student teaching experiences that you think could be improved and specific ways of improving them.

D. Teaching Competencies: (Refer to Part V.) What additional competencies do you suggest?

E. Other Suggestions: Include references to academic courses (Part II) as well as counseling and placement.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please return completed questionnaire to Dr. Edward Frankel in the enclosed self-addressed envelope no later than May 1, 1973.

APPENDIX C

TABLE

COMPARISON OF MEAN E AND V RATINGS AND THEIR RANK ORDER OF PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

APPENDIX C

COMPARISON OF MEAN F AND V RATINGS AND THEIR RANK-ORDER OF PRE-STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

	F Ratings				V Ratings			
	Elem		Sec		Elem		Sec	
Experiences	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
1. Observing classroom teachers	3.11	6	3.26	4	3.85	3	4.05	1
n2. Observing student teachers	2.11	15	2.00	16	3.19	11	3.30	9.5
n3. Becoming familiar with community agencies	2.14	14	2.21	14	2.99	15	3.06	14
4. Presenting simulated lessons	3.09	7	2.92	7	3.08	13.5	3.37	8
5. Conferences with classroom teachers	2.93	10	3.35	1	3.78	4	3.91	3
6. Conferences with school supervisors	2.52	13	2.89	8	3.18	12	3.30	9.5
n7. Conferences with parents	1.78	16	2.11	15	3.26	10	2.96	15
8. Conferences with students	2.81	11	2.84	9	3.57	6.5	3.65	6
9. Seminar with college supervisor	3.37	2	3.25	5	3.08	13.5	3.09	13
10. Working with individual students	3.36	3	3.30	2.5	3.96	2	3.86	4
11. Working with small groups of students	3.38	1	3.17	6	4.00	1	3.93	2
n12. Working in camps, community centers, etc.	3.28	4	3.30	2.5	3.57	6.5	3.73	5
n13. Working in after-school centers	3.17	5	2.57	12	3.45	8.5	3.21	12
14. Seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods	2.64	12	2.28	13	2.75	16	2.86	16
15. Microteaching or practice teaching sessions in a school	2.97	9	2.68	11	3.71	5	3.40	7
n16. Working with paraprofessionals	3.04	8	2.73	10	3.45	8.5	3.25	11
Average mean	2.97		2.95		3.47		3.54	
Rank difference correlation coefficient	0.65**				0.81**			

**Significant at the .01 level.

nAt least half the ratings for these items were N-never occurred.

APPENDIX D

TABLE

MEAN FREQUENCY (F) AND VALUE (V) RATINGS
FOR PRE-STUDENT TEACHING FIELD EXPERIENCES AND THEIR RANK ORDER

APPENDIX D

MEAN FREQUENCY (F) AND VALUE (V) RATINGS
FOR PRE-STUDENT TEACHING FIELD EXPERIENCES AND THEIR RANK ORDER

Experiences	Mean Ratings F	Rank	V	Rank
1. Observing classroom teachers	3.17	5	3.92	3
[n]2. Observing student teachers	2.08	15	3.23	10.5
[n]3. Becoming familiar with community agencies	2.17	14	3.01	15
4. Presenting simulated lessons	3.04	7	3.17	12
5. Conferences with classroom teachers	3.08	6	3.83	4
6. Conferences with school supervisors	2.65	12	3.23	10.5
[n]7. Conferences with parents	1.93	16	3.12	13
8. Conferences with students	2.82	11	3.61	7
9. Seminar with college supervisor	3.33	2	3.09	14
10. Working with individual students	3.35	1	3.93	2
11. Working with small groups of students	3.32	3	3.98	1
[n]12. Working in camps, community centers, etc.	3.29	4	3.63	5
[n]13. Working in after-school centers	2.93	9	3.35	9
14. Seeing films or videotapes on teaching methods	2.56	13	2.78	16
15. Microteaching or practice teaching sessions in a school	2.89	10	3.62	6
[n]16. Working with paraprofessionals	2.95	8	3.38	8
Rank difference correlation coefficient		0.63**		

**Significant at the .01 level.

[n]At least half the ratings for these items were N-never occurred.

APPENDIX E

TABLE

MEAN MASTERY RATINGS OF COMPETENCIES
FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

APPENDIX E

MEAN MASTERY RATINGS OF COMPETENCIES
FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Competencies	Elementary Mean	Elementary Rank	Secondary Mean	Secondary Rank	Both Mean	Both Rank
1. Understanding the school as a social institution	2.70	8.5	2.69	9.5	2.70	9
2. Developing a personal philosophy of education	2.82	4.5	2.94	3	2.87	3.5
3. Developing long-range educational objectives	2.55	13	2.75	8	2.62	12
4. Motivating students	3.13	2	3.01	2	3.09	2
5. Developing skills in interpersonal relations	2.82	4.5	2.78	7	2.81	5.5
6. Classroom management and routines	2.95	3	2.69	9.5	2.87	3.5
7. Coping with behavior problems in the classroom	2.18	16	2.05	18.5	2.14	17.5
8. Counseling students in your classes	2.14	19	1.93	21	2.07	20
9. Understanding learning theory as applied to classroom teaching	2.33	14	2.21	15.5	2.29	15
10. Designing lesson plans with distinct objectives	3.15	1	3.15	1	3.15	1
11. Developing competencies in specific teaching skills	2.75	6	2.91	4	2.81	5.5
12. Leading class discussions	2.67	11	2.59	11	2.65	10
13. Individualizing instruction	2.17	17	2.21	15.5	2.19	16
14. Identifying learning difficulties	2.13	20	2.05	18.5	2.11	19
15. Identifying emotional difficulties	2.16	18	2.08	17	2.14	17.5
16. Applying effective tests for evaluating student readiness and progress	1.99	21	1.97	20	1.99	21
17. Teaching non-English speaking children	1.50	26	1.38	24	1.47	26
18. Understanding racial and cultural differences	2.62	12	2.87	5	2.71	8
19. Using instructional media, films, transparencies, etc.	2.68	10	2.29	14	2.56	13
20. Preparing films, slides, audiotapes, etc.	1.92	22	1.70	22	1.86	22
21. Working with parents	1.63	25	1.34	25	1.54	25
22. Working with paraprofessionals	1.70	24	1.32	26	1.58	24
23. Understanding and utilizing research literature	2.32	15	2.36	13	2.34	14
24. Developing an enthusiasm for continuing professional growth	2.70	8.5	2.84	6	2.75	7
25. Familiarity with and use of community resources	1.86	23	1.60	23	1.78	23
26. Understanding developmental capabilities and problems of children	2.71	7	2.49	12	2.64	11
Average	2.44		2.38		2.42	

t = 2.36